

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-28 are pending in the application.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-9, 11 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niwa (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0225696 A1) in view of Christensen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,055,543).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable because Niwa in view of Christensen fail to disclose packaging a plurality of files comprising the SMIL document and **the plurality of resource files** into a single file using the extracted information, in combination with other elements of the claim.

In the Office Action, it is conceded that the above features are not disclosed by Niwa but alleges that Fig. 5, column 5, lines 25-31, and column 6, lines 19-27 of Christensen discloses the above features. Figure 5 depicts a wrapper 40 which includes a **single** content 20 and metadata 42. Column 5, lines 25-31 and column 6, lines 19-27 show that all the metadata 42 correspond to the **single** content 20 in the wrapper 40 and **do not disclose** having a plurality of resource files in a single file.

Rather, to characterize the content 20 in Christensen as allegedly disclosing the claimed plurality of resource files would be entirely contrary to the teachings of Christensen because having more than one content in the wrapper 40 would defeat the purpose of being able to identify a single specific content based on its corresponding metadata 42.

Even if assuming *arguendo*, that the Examiner is arguing that the package of Christensen (col. 6, lines 21-27) corresponds to the claimed single file, we would still argue that claim 1 is patentable because Christensen does not disclose extracting information on a plurality of resource files and forming a header based on the extracted information, in combination with other elements of claim 1. Instead, the header 52 disclosed by Christensen merely corresponds to a single content file 20, and **does not** correspond to a plurality of content files 20. In other words, the header 52 is **not** generated from any sort of information extracted from a **plurality** of content files 20.

Applicant submits that column 6, lines 32-39 and column 7, lines 51-52, all disclose the same header 52 which is generated for a single content file 20. *See* Fig. 5.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, claim 11 is patentable.

Claims 3-7 and 13-20, 22-26 and 28, which depend from claim 1 or 11, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentable because Niwa and Christensen fail to disclose a method wherein the plurality of the indexing information are consecutively disposed together and precedes the plurality of resource files. Applicant submits that the recitations of claim 8 are not nonfunctional descriptive material because the claim lays out the inherent functional relationship between the plurality of indexing information and the plurality of resource files. In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, the indexing information is used to read the resource file. ¶ 52. Since the plurality of indexing information are consecutively disposed together and precedes the plurality of resource files, it is not

necessary for a computer to process each of the plurality of resource files. In other words, the computer need not process both the indexing information **and** the corresponding resource file to determine if the requested resource file has been found. Rather, the computer can simply process just the indexing information for all of the plurality of resource files before processing any resource information. See ¶ 52 and 53.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 20-22 present a functional description which would affect a way a computer operates and should be viewed as having patentable weight.

Further, Applicant submits that Fig. 5 of Christensen shows a header 52 and a directory of tags 54 which precedes a **single** content file 20, and **not** a plurality of content files.

Applicant submits that claims 23-25 present functional descriptions which describe the contents of the header file which correspond to the plurality of content files. Applicant submits that Christensen merely discloses a header 52 for a single content file 20.

Claims 26 and 28 also provide a functional description, as the information to adjust the reproduction time of each media object included in the plurality of resource files, layouts on a screen, and screen division, all would functionally affect how a pc would display the information.

As for claim 8, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable because Niwa in view of Christensen fails to disclose extracting the information comprising extracting respective name, length, and offset information of each of the plurality of files included in the SMIL integrated file, in combination with other elements of the claim. While Christensen discloses a tag size field 58 indicating the length of tag 50 or the length of metadata in tag data field 60 (col. 7, lines 33-38), Christensen fails to disclose indicating the length of the content file 20 in wrapper 40.

Therefore, Christensen cannot possibly disclose extracting length of **each of the files** included in the SMIL integrated file or searching for the predetermine resource file from among a plurality of resource files by referring to length information of each of the plurality of files included in the SMIL integrate file, as recited in claim 8.

Claims 9, 21 and 27, which depend from claim 8, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 8.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124

Date: February 15, 2008